

when you look at things in historic terms and you look at the great trauma and the great Civil War which resulted, for example, from the question of states' rights, this is one of the questions that has the ability to cut across great sections of the country and I think you want to be profoundly careful with this question. And I know this sounds stupid at this point in the debate, but I think we have to think far in advance and we have to think in historical terms and we have to go very slow. And I think that Senator Witek's amendment helps us to go a little slower in the sense that it will tend to bifurcate the process. It will tend to make this conference a conference by which we can make a united demand upon the national government for changes. But I think it ought not to be a conference that threatens the national government with constitutional amendments, nor should it formulate and focus in people's minds constitutional amendments, proposed constitutional amendments drawn up by delegates who were not sent to that conference specifically and decidedly for that very purpose. If we're going to go down that path, then I think we should (1) have this conference, (2) have this discussion with the federal government, and (3) if things don't work out agreeably for the people and for the states, then let's have another resolution and another conference and go down the other path, but let's not mix up the two paths. You know how sometimes when the media grabs hold of some of these ideas out there and all of a sudden they are elevated way up here and they have no authority way down here from you and I and the people who we elect to represent us, and I don't think the people of the state would want us sending off delegates to...on such a mission without a very clear understanding of what it is they are to do or not to do. There are certain things happening at the federal level right now, certain reactions that we may find satisfactory in the end. The balanced budget amendment is essentially one vote away, it will happen, and that is one constitutional amendment that I support. Thomas Jefferson supported it. He said it was one of the three flaws in the United States Constitution. I think he's right. We shouldn't be burdening our children the way we do, but if that happens there will be a lot less money there to go to the states, we know that, and those strings that have caused so many of our problems, those monetary strings will not be there, so probably a lot of the things that we consider mandates or we do because we lose the federal money will not be there. As I understand it and I would perhaps like Senator Kristensen, if he knows anything about it, to expound a little bit more on the no mandates, legislation and/or constitutional